

CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPIST.

DEVOTED TO LITERATURE AND RELIGION.

PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY, BY DANIEL K. WHITAKER, NEW-BEDFORD.

VOL. I.

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1822.

No. 7.

MISCELLANY.

THE MORAL TENDENCY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

There are two very certain methods by which mankind may arrive at the discovery of religious truth. One of them consists in an application of the practical precepts of Christianity to the life, agreeably to the language of our Saviour, *he that doeth his will shall know of the doctrine*; the other consists in an effort of the understanding, which without stopping to demonstrate, takes certain principles for granted, and considers their moral effect, and receives or rejects them according as they have a good or bad tendency. Each of these methods may be equally safe, as they finally lead to the same result. The following piece, taken from the "Unitarian Miscellany," which adopts the latter of them, cannot, we think, fail to awaken the most serious considerations in the mind of every person who esteems purity of heart and holiness of life of more importance to the salvation of man, than the speculative opinions of any sect of Christians whatever, considered abstractly, without regard to their moral influence.

"As the doctrine of the Trinity embraces no moral precepts, nor immediate rules of action, its good or evil tendency must depend on the power it exerts in giving a tone and bias to the mind favourable or unfavorable to just notions of the Deity, to the reception of moral truth, a reverence for the known laws of God, a respect for the voice of conscience, and a habitual frame of piety and benevolence. It has a very remote bearing, if any at all, on the clearness and obligation of the preceptive and practical part of religion. Trinitarians and unitarians are equally convinced of the divine origin, and absolute truth of every thing which the Saviour taught; they equally consider all his ordinances and precepts as imposing commands, which must be implicitly obeyed. Hence it is, that neither a belief, nor disbelief of the doctrine has any tendency to diminish or strengthen the authority of the christian religion, as it relates to the necessity of obedience, re-pentance, reformation, and a holy life.

We are not hence to infer, that the trinity is an error of no consequence. All error is injurious. Of truth we can say with certainty, that it will always lead to good ends; error, on the contrary, however innocent in itself, must be pernicious in its results. It cannot be doubted that many christians have been good and pious with erroneous creeds, but it is a case equally indubitable, that they would have been better with true ones.—The criminality, and the evil of error are very different things; a man is compelled to believe according to his convictions; he may be deceived; many evils may follow from this deception, but no crime can be attached, unless there has been a culpable indolence, or a perverted will, or some unhallowed purpose in forming opinions. A belief in the trinity involves no crime; its iniquity consists in its evil consequences; it obscures the perfections of the Deity, obstructs the current of devotional feeling, perplexes the humble inquirer after truth, and thus essentially impairs the means and motives of a rational worship, practical piety, and vital godliness.

In attempting to trace out the tendency of the trinity, it is important to attain some definite notions of the doctrine itself; and here we shall be forced to encounter much difficulty at the very outset. It would be no easy task to enumerate the parties into which the advocates for this doctrine have been divided, from the time of its origin to the present day, and the opposing schemes which they have invented to bring it within the compass of the human faculties. They have not yet approached so near to a similarity of views as to agree in a definition. One of the heaviest censures affected to be passed by the orthodox on unitarians, is, that they do not agree in explaining their own opinions. Before this is insisted on any further, we should be glad if trinitarians themselves would unite in some common explanation of the doctrine, which they profess to think the most important in religion; or at least show some good reason, why we are to reverence as a fundamental article of faith, a doctrine, which cannot be defined in scripture language, and which is confessed to be unintelligible, and inexplicable. The truth is that no plan has been devised, which was not encumbered with so many insurmountable difficulties, that few minds could be induced to receive it in that shape. Hence plans have been multiplied, the powers of invention and combination have been put in requisition, till the theories of the trinity have become as numerous as the writers by whom it has been attempted to be explained.

Amidst this chaos of incertitude and variety, a few landmarks may be discerned, which seem to have served as common guides; and the numerous schemes to which the prolific invention of theologians has given birth, may all be arranged, perhaps, without much violence, under two general ones, the *Sabellian*, and the *Tripersonal*. The former teaches a trinity of modes in the Deity, the latter a trinity of beings. The modalists have succeeded in establishing a trinity in name, and in destroying it in reality, for there is no more reason for supposing the Deity to exist in three modes, than in three hundred. As neither the unity, nor the attributes of God, are affected by this system, it differs in no essential respect from unitarianism; its bearing is nearly the same on the object of worship, and means of piety.

Another general scheme, or rather a substitute for a scheme, has lately grown up, and gained much popularity. It is that which shrouds the trinity in a *mystery*. This is a last resort; it rejects the aid of reason, and throws an impenetrable veil of obscurity over revelation. It is, nevertheless, founded on a principle of universal application; whenever you are perplexed in any argument, or caught between the gripping horns of a dilemma, you have only to cry out, *a mystery*, and your victory is accomplished; you are encased in an armour of adamant, and may exult with great composure over the weakness of your antagonist, who can wield no other weapons, than such as are supplied by common sense, reason, and plain truth. No one, it is presumed, ever put on this armour till he found these weapons inadequate to his purpose. A mystical revelation is a contradiction in terms; and a mystical trinity, whatever else it may mean, can never mean a revealed trinity. Just in proportion as you detect

mysteries in the Gospel, or doctrines, which were professedly taught as revealed truths of the greatest importance, but not intended to be understood, just so far you will find reason to distrust the divine authority of the religion of the Saviour, and to disrespect its author. What there is in a mystery especially conducive to morals and piety, must be left to the wisdom of the initiated to develop.

The kind of trinity, to which my future remarks will be directed, is that contained in the Confession of Faith, and which I conceive to approach nearer than either of the others to an undisguised exposition of the doctrine. "In the unity of the godhead, there be but three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost." As a general definition, this seems sufficiently clear. Every one, probably, who assents to it, has views peculiar to himself respecting the nature and relations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, yet all suppose them to be three distinct beings, and that each being is God. It is no part of my present object to inquire how it could be brought to pass, that three beings, each of whom is God, could make one being, and one God; or how there could be three beings, each of whom is God, and not be three Gods. I am engaged with the tendency, and not with the truth, or consistency of this doctrine.

In the first place, the notion of the trinity destroys the simplicity of worship, and essentially weakens all the good effects, which we may expect to derive from a pure and spiritual devotion. If there be one precept in the Scriptures, more positive than any other, it is, that the undivided homage of men is due to ONE BEING, to the Supreme God alone. It was the command of our Saviour himself, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." "True worshippers," he tells us, "shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." We are to adore and reverence him as our Creator, to praise him as the source of all good, to love and thank him for his paternal care and kindness. As he is the sole author of all things, he is to receive our sole homage, submission, gratitude. In the dispensations of providence, and in the christian religion, no feature is so striking, as that which manifests the existence of one supreme object of worship, one God of infinite perfections, who claims all our services.

How do we retain this great characteristic of our religion, in what respect do we obey the commands of Christ, when we make three objects of worship, when we lift up our voices in adoration and prayer to three separate beings, and address them each as the supreme, self-existent, independent God? When you offer prayers to God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, let it be admitted, that you do not consider them three Gods, although each is called God; you must, notwithstanding, have a notion of three distinct beings at the time of your devotions, and address them as such. You worship three Gods in form and imagination, that is, in reality, so far as your conceptions of the Deity present an object to the understanding.

You do not see God; and you must worship him under such properties, as you are able to conceive and combine to form his nature and character. If

you have in your mind three separate beings, possessing each the same properties as the others, and address them as separate, equal beings, and under different titles; it is perfectly certain, that the nature of your worship, and its effects on the mind and character, will be precisely the same, as if you acknowledged yourself to be worshipping three Gods. From this kind of worship, two evils of no common magnitude follow; first, the crime of disobeying a divine command, in not acting the part of "true worshippers," who, our Saviour tells us, worship the FATHER; secondly, all the practical ill consequences, which flow from having three objects of religious worship instead of one.

Unitarians avoid these evils by adhering rigidly to simplicity and unity in their worship. With them, God is believed to be one being; they worship him in his undivided and infinitely perfect character; their love and gratitude, adoration and reverence, confidence and joy, all centre in him. They dare not ascribe to any other being the honors and glory, which the Scriptures everywhere command us to render to the Father. They adore his goodness for the means, which he has provided for our salvation through the instructions of his Son. They honor Christ as the appointed Saviour, whom God endowed in an eminent degree with the gifts of his spirit, with the strength of his power, with the light of his wisdom and truth; they feel towards him all the veneration, gratitude, and affection, which his heavenly office, his sublime instructions, his trials and sufferings justly demand; but they do not worship him as God, because the Scriptures teach, and reason verifies the truth, that there is but "ONE GOD, the FATHER," who requires our unceasing and undivided service. Jesus himself always prayed to the Father, and said to his disciples in terms which it would seem impossible to mistake, "in that day ye shall ask me nothing; whatsoever ye shall ask the FATHER in my name, he will give it you." Can you have a plainer declaration, that the Father *only* is to be worshipped? From views like the above, unitarians are strengthened in the belief that their system of faith is true, that it has greatly the advantage of the trinitarian scheme in securing a pure and scriptural worship, promoting love to God, and kindling the fervour of a steady piety."

(To be continued.)

GENIUS—RELIGION.

It ought to humble the pride of Genius to consider, that it is liable to fall into the greatest speculative absurdities. Genius, joined with extensive power, and a beneficent disposition can indeed scarcely fail to secure the happiness, the esteem, and the affection of mankind. Rectitude of conduct in public life, depends much more upon a quick and almost intuitive discernment of propriety, than upon long and complex trains of reasoning; but in the closet, the man of Genius appears in a great measure to loose his pre-eminence.

Human nature is so unequal to the investigation of truth, that a mind of the highest powers, which ventures to confide in its own superiority, is quickly lost in a labyrinth of perplexity and error.

Truth is to be attained, as far as it is attainable by so weak and imperfect a being as man, by patient, laborious, and attentive consideration; by divesting ourselves of passion and prejudice, by commencing our inquiries with doubt and diffidence, and by extending a candid and equal regard to the arguments on every side, and weighing them in the balance of strict and impartial justice. The man of Genius is frequently deficient in almost all those essential requisites for the discovery of moral truth. Full of ardour and enthusiasm, and elate with the consciousness of superior talents, he thinks it su-

perfluous to devote that portion of time and patience to the investigation of truth, which its nature indispensably requires. He forms his opinions with precipitation, and when once formed, his pride is engaged to vindicate and support them. As his feelings are strong, and the faculty of association vigorous and powerful, his first opinions, originally formed on very slight grounds, soon degenerate into inveterate prejudices; and in this state of mind he treats with contempt or indignation all arguments, but such as have a tendency to confirm him in error; and his superiority of Genius only serves, by supplying him with endless fancies, to plunge him deeper and deeper into the abysses of absurdity and extravagance. This is a point long ago determined by a judge, whose knowledge of human nature I suppose no one will venture to call in question.

"None are so surely caught when they are catch'd,
As wit turn'd fool; folly in wisdom batch'd,
Hath wisdom's warrant, and the help of school,
And wit's own grace, to grace a learned fool."

Love's Labour Lost.

I have always, however, thought a man of Genius, entangled in absurdity, an object of compassion, rather than of ridicule. To exult over an antagonist of this description, is to triumph over the weakness of human nature. "On doit," says the Marquis de Mirabeau, very generously, "une indulgence presqu'illimitée aux grands hommes quand ils ont évidemment tort."

It is a prevailing opinion, and I think it is an opinion founded on fact, that melancholy is a very frequent attendant on genius. How is this to be accounted for? Enthusiasm, or ardour of mind, is certainly a striking characteristic of genius: but this is a quality apparently incompatible with melancholy, which deprives the mind of every degree of force and vigor, and leaves it without any proper stimulus to action. The difficulty may perhaps be solved by supposing that enthusiasm is natural to genius, and melancholy only an accidental and adventitious quality.—None are so liable to disappointments in the world as men of genius, and melancholy is the natural consequence of disappointment. Their feelings, too refined for their own happiness, are wounded by neglect; sometimes, perhaps, by insult. Their taste for beauty and order, is shocked by the scenes of folly, vice, and misery, perpetually presented to their view; the common concerns of life appear to them flat, insipid and uninteresting. They first grow weary of the world, and then of themselves. The best remedy for this disease of the mind is religion; I mean that religion which is founded on reason and on truth, and which inspires a firm belief in the existence of an infinitely powerful, wise, and benevolent Being; and a full persuasion, that the present system of things is, in all its parts, consistent with the natural and moral perfections of its divine author; and that the course of events is tending to a happy and glorious consummation. This religion, sublimed by faith, and invigorated by hope, exacts from us, first, the deepest reverence and gratitude to God, and next, unbounded love and benevolence to mankind. It informs us, that the great object of life ought to be the advancement of human happiness—A truly noble and animating principle of action in itself; but how much more so, when we have ground to believe, that no effort directed to this end shall be finally lost. No effort wholly lost, perhaps, with respect to others; and as to ourselves, we have a divine assurance, that even a cup of cold water, given in the true spirit of Christian benevolence, shall not fail to meet with its reward.

W. BELSHAM.

Christian Philanthropist.

NEW-BEDFORD, JUNE 25, 1822.

HISTORY OF LETTERS.—CONTINUED.

It is well known that there were certain fortuitous events and general principles, which contributed to the formation of a literary character in Italy, which could not operate at all, or at least not with equal force in any other nation. We refer to those principles which resulted, not from its original condition, but from its state in after ages, when the progress of conquest had introduced new manners, habits and sentiments which differed widely from those of the people of the East. The gloomy superstition of the North, and the spirit of chivalry united to the poetical invention and energy of the conquered people, and tempered by the metaphysical theology of the Greeks, produced upon the whole a combination far more complicate than that which is brought about by the ordinary tenor of national events. It is necessary to distinguish with accuracy those features which may properly be termed characteristic of the nation from those which were derived more immediately from their intercourse, alliance and intermixture with foreigners. These are found blended together in all their productions, more especially in their romances and works of fiction.

The constant turmoil in which the states of Italy were kept by the conflicting interests and ceaseless contentions of the ecclesiastical and temporal authorities was highly injurious both to letters and philosophy. The attention of the learned could not be directed long enough to any pursuit to take advantage of the new events and various incidents which repeated contests and revolutionary struggles always produce. We pass from century to century without discovering any thing worthy of notice till we arrive to the age of the celebrated Leo Xth, which we think bears some degree of resemblance to that of Augustus in Rome, and that of Louis XIVth in France. The decided ascendancy which this illustrious pontiff maintained in politics, joined to his highly cultivated taste, was favourable to more concentrated and uninterrupted efforts in some of the different departments of learning. Under the government of the Medici in general, but more particularly under that of Leo Xth, the polite arts and sciences were carried to the highest degree of perfection. It was in this age that those great geniuses, Ariosto, Tasso, Machiavel, Guichardini, Bernini, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Titian, Paul Veronese, and many others sprang up and rendered their names immortal.

The great power of which Leo was possessed, the excellent education he had received, and the protection which he extended to learned men, excited throughout Italy a general attention to literary pursuits. This is far however, from proving that a despotism is any way desirable or favourable in its ultimate tendency to the progress of the mind, or to the free and independant exercise of the understanding. If it proves any thing, it is the reverse of this. The emulation it may excite will be carefully diverted from pursuits which cross its own path, and are dangerous to itself. Poetry and those arts which are the mere picture of sympathy and of the sentiments of the heart, may be cultivated perhaps with success under any government, but more particularly under one that has been subject to frequent changes—which has been the theatre of disastrous calamities, or of repeated revolutions, as such events furnish numerous subjects for fanciful description and pathetic representation, the interest of which is greatly heightened by the effects of contrast. But eloquence and political philosophy, which derive their support less from external nature than

from reflection on the general course of affairs, and from the discovery of important truths, which have a decisive bearing on the happiness of mankind and the welfare of nations, as they are the natural enemies of tyranny, have been thwarted and disconcerted by every despot who has appeared upon the stage of life. As the protection which an absolute, though perhaps an enlightened ruler may extend to the arts, proceeds either from a desire to amuse his vacant hours by contemplating the splendid productions of genius and the labours of successive ages, or from a care to divert the attention of the people from the ambitious and dangerous motives which characterise and give a colouring to his public administration, it would be impossible to extort any thing from the condition of the arts in Italy, in the time of Leo Xth, which should lead us to the praise and commendation of tyranny, which always degrades the mind and prevents all elevation of soul. It certainly would be better to destroy entirely the works of imagination than to sacrifice to them the love of country and the progressive improvement of the human race.

The progress of civilization in Spain, it is well known, was much slower than in any other nation of modern Europe. The principles which operate generally with great uniformity in the establishment of a national character, were for a long time interrupted, and indeed never produced such marked characteristics as to render its intellectual accomplishments the object of particular regard to men of letters. Spain, if possible, was more unfortunate than Italy in its political condition. Each of the different nations who came to inhabit it after the time of the Northern conquest, bro't along with it its own laws and particular form of government, from which resulted a diversity of genius, temper, manners and customs, which prevented that coalition of the different members of the body politic which is necessary to the prosecution and success of any important national enterprise. It was natural to expect that those who had distinguished themselves in any way under the influence of the peculiar political institutions of the countries from which they were originally driven, would have given some dignified evidence of the genius they had inherited from their ancestors, in any region where they might have fled for refuge, and that they would have continued to advance in those solitary paths which they had first marked out to themselves, under circumstances more auspicious. This would have been the natural result, if with the wreck of their former government they had carried along with them sufficient strength to collect and to put together again its shattered fragments, or ingenuity enough to re-model it in such a manner as to give it greater permanency than it had before—if moreover, they could have taken along with them the climate and scenery to which they had been always accustomed, and the ideas which never fail to result from local associations. This however was not possible. Each of the political systems brought with it the seeds of its own dissolution, and was soon succeeded by some new one, which was not the result of superior skill, but rather the effect of greater physical power, operating successfully by the force of arms. The Romans enervated by the ancient despotism, having lost those high ideas of liberty and glory, with which they were once inspired, and being actuated by no nobler sentiment than that of fear, were unable to maintain a separate political existence for many centuries in their new settlements.

They were supplanted by the Goths, whose gloomy and roving habits rendered them unfit for the restraints of civilized society. To wander among the mountains, to pursue the chase, to gain

trophies in war, to settle private disputes according to the point of honour, and to rescue distressed damsels at the expense of life, were the things most congenial to their temper, and in which they believed their gods who took delight in carnage and bloodshed, were most likely to prosper them. The Moors, who were naturally animated by the heat of the climate in their own country, gave to their imaginations an unlimited indulgence, deserted the pursuit of philosophical truth, which had really an existence *in rerum natura*, but was not calculated at the time to lessen the rigours of Oriental despotism, and being destitute entirely of that practical knowledge which always accompanies a portion of political influence in any state, they were found to be but poorly qualified to practice the art of government in Spain. No principle could be discovered for a long time sufficiently energetic to blend together into one mass elements so repulsive as those which existed there, till finally the Christian religion appeared and accomplished that which nothing else could have done. When the petty dynasties which existed in almost every province were dissolved, and the sovereign power of the nation came finally to be vested in the inheritors of the crowns of Castile and Aragon, it was natural to expect that an attention to literary pursuits would have made an important part of the national reform.

This, however, was not the fortunate result, for "the united despotism of Spain in encouraging the active power of the Inquisition, left no pursuit for thought, no resource nor means for escaping the yoke." The study of philosophy being entirely neglected, it was the fatal effect of this terrible institution to destroy all literary emulation, and only a few works of acknowledged merit were ever produced, such as the Lusiad of Camoens, and the comedies of Calderoni and Lopez de Vega, to convince the world what the Spaniards might have become, if they had happened to have been a free and independent people.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Celebration of National Independence.

The following curious notice appeared in the last New-Bedford Mercury, which we copy as a rare precedent for those who shall hereafter be inclined to identify the doctrine of the trinity, or any other dogma of the schools, or remnant of popery with the annual celebration of our national Independence.

Notice.—The Ministers of the different Churches in New-Bedford and Fairhaven, embracing the doctrine of the TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD, having united in design to spend the Fourth of July in the worship of Almighty God, give notice that their meeting will be holden the present year, in the Meeting-house of the Rev. PAUL JEWET, in Fairhaven. Public worship will commence at half past 10 A. M. A Sermon will be preached on the occasion. Christians of all denominations are invited to unite in expressions of gratitude to Almighty God, for the rich blessings of political, civil and religious liberty. June 21."

At some future period we may expect to see notices of the celebration of this anniversary adapted to every creed and formula of faith which the pharisaical affectation of superio'r sanctity and wisdom has ever given birth to. Year after year those eagle-eyed Arguses who stand at the fountain-head of inspiration, our Recorders, Heralds, Spectators, and the whole train of powerful agents, whose responses are equally oracular with theirs, may inform the public, several weeks before the auspicious day arrives, with all the pomposity requisite to the announcement of so important an event—that "those who believe in the doctrine of the trinity" or "those who believe in the doctrine of total depravity" or "those who believe in the doctrine of unconditional election," or "those who

hold to the final perseverance of the saints, are expected to meet in their respective houses of public worship on the approaching 4th of July, to commemorate the independence of America!" We have however never been able to ascertain what peculiar degree of intimacy is supposed to exist between the appropriate ceremonies of the day and any particular article of religious belief. The excitement occasioned by the splendour of the parade, the military movements, the martial music, the assemblage of the people, the procession of the citizens, the banquet, and all the glad and joyous festivities of the occasion, may have a secret bearing on religious doctrines which was unknown to our predecessors, and the discovery of which must be claimed as the distinguished honour of the present age, and of the enlightened geniuses of this section of our country.

That public worship should make a part of the ceremonies of the day, has ever been esteemed highly proper. To dedicate it entirely to religious services would give it perhaps rather too sable a hue; but we consider the above notice a manifest disrespect to our national independence itself and its celebration on these occasions. The trinity is the doctrine of a particular denomination of Christians. The intention of liberty is to destroy all usurping sects and parties, and to place men in a state of political equality. We, as a people, know of no infallible standard of faith. Our constitution tolerates all sects, but it recognizes the supremacy of no one. We may properly express our gratitude to God on that day that it does so. When we assemble together to call to mind our rights as a free and independent people, we do not expect to hear announced to us the right which authorizes the citizens of America to believe the doctrine of the Trinity. There is no such item in the Declaration of Rights. We learn from it only that we are permitted to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. Farther than this our wise legislators did not think proper to go. They had learnt from the history of other nations, that nothing was more to be dreaded than religious persecution. By tolerating all religions, they considered that they should prevent any particular sect of Christians from controlling or tyrannizing over the rest, making it necessary in all doubtful cases of a hostile nature, to appeal, as a dernier resort, to the supreme authority of the land.

We do not know whether the sermon which is to be preached will go to prove solely the doctrine of the trinity, or whether the writer of the notice assumed this ostentatious method in order to attract the attention of the orthodox in this vicinity, and to draw them together to partake of a feast of fat things, and finally to disappoint their expectation by something more liberat. However this may be, in a temporal point of view we presume they will not be disappointed if they rely at all upon the hospitality by which the people in this part of the country are so eminently distinguished.

Dr. J. W. Webster, of Boston, U. S. has been elected a Member of the Geological Society of London.

—The communication of C. will appear in our next.

Errata.—In some of the first papers which were struck off the last week, the piece taken from Yates on the "Unity of God," was not acknowledged. In the first paragraph of the "History of Letters," for the following words, "to call for the enterprize," read "to call forth enterprize." In the fourth paragraph, for "the light of the comets," read "the flight of the comets;" and in the last paragraph of the same, for "national enjoyment," read "rational enjoyment." Towards the close of the communication on the first page, for the words "and sufficient for the salvation of man," read "and suffered for the salvation of man."

POETRY.

FROM THE BOSTON SPECTATOR.

TO THE MOON.

WHAT is it that gives thee, mild queen of the night,
Thy secret, intelligent grace?
And why should I gaze with such tender delight
On thy fair, but insensible face?
What gentle enchantment possesses thy beam
Beyond the warm sunshine of day?
Thy bosom is cold, as the glittering stream
Where dances thy tremulous ray.
Canst thou the sad heart of its sorrow beguile,
Or Grief's fond indulgence suspend?
Yet where is the mourner, but welcomes thy smile,
And loves thee almost as a friend?
The tear, that looks bright on thy beam, as it flows,
Unknow'd thou dost ever behold;
The sorrow, that loves in thy light to repose,
To thee it has ever been cold.
O yet thou dost soothe me, and ever I find,
While watching thy gentle retreat,
A moonlight composure steal over my mind,
Poetical, pensive, and sweet;—
It tells me of years, that forever are fled,
Of follies, by others forgot,
Of joys that have vanish'd, of hopes that are dead,
Of friendships that were, and are not.
I think of the future, while gazing the while,
As thou could'st those secrets reveal;
Yet ne'er dost thou grant an encouraging smile
To answer the mournful appeal.
These beams, that so bright thro' my easement appear,
To far distant scenes they extend;
Illumine the dwellings of those that are dear,
And sleep on the grave of a friend.
Then still must I love thee, mild queen of the night,
Since feeling and fancy agree
To make thee a source of unfailing delight,
A friend and a solace to me.

E.

TRAIT OF LOCKE.

This great man, in his early years, had contracted a very particular friendship with a young fellow who had lived in the same neighborhood from his infancy. This esteem Mr. Locke carried so high, that he considered his friend's interest as inseparably connected with his own, and looked upon any instance of good fortune in either to be a means of advancing the welfare of both. However, having once got into the favor of some people in power, the friend began to envy the situation of Mr. Locke; and, judging of that good man's heart by his own, supposed he would withdraw his friendship as he increased in fortune. Fraught with this opinion, he endeavored to supplant Mr. Locke in the esteem of his friends, and to engage protection for himself, by the discovery of every secret which the other had trusted him with in the unsuspecting openness of his heart; finding, however, that all attempts of this nature were fruitless, he suddenly disappeared, and carried off a sum of money, the property of his friend, which he knew must involve him in the greatest distress. Mr. Locke felt severely for the perfidy of his friend, and was to the last degree surprised, when informed of the methods he had taken to ruin his interest; but, still continuing his application to business, and deserving the favor of his patrons, he was advanced to some places of no inconsiderable profit and honor.

One morning while he was at breakfast, word was brought that a man in a very shabby habit requested the honor of speaking to him. Mr. Locke, whom no advancement could raise above the practise of good manners, immediate-

ly ordered him to be admitted, and found to his great astonishment, his old friend reduced by a life of cunning and extravagance to the greatest poverty and distress, and come to implore his assistance and solicit his forgiveness. Mr. Locke looked at him for some time very steadfastly, without speaking one word: at length, taking out a fifty pound note, he presented it to him with the following remarkable declaration:

"Though I sincerely forgive your behaviour to me, yet I must never put it in your power to injure me a second time.—Take this trifle, which I give not as a mark of my former friendship, but as a relief to your present wants, and consign it to the service of your necessities, without recollecting how little you deserve.—No reply:—it is impossible to gain my good opinion, for know, friendship once injured is lost forever!"

CONDORCET.

Among the Girondists, prosecuted by Robespierre, on the 31st of May, 1793, Condorcet was the very first on the list, and was obliged to skulk in the most obscure corners, to elude the persecutions of the furious Jacobins. A lady, to whom he was known only by name, became, at the instance of a common friend, his generous protectress, concealing him in her house at Paris, at the most imminent hazard, till the latter end of April, 1794; when the apprehension of general domiciliary visits so much increased, and the risk of exposing both himself and his patroness, became so pressing on the mind of Condorcet, that he resolved to quit Paris.

Without either passport or civic card, he contrived under the disguise of a Provencal country-woman, with a white cap on his head, to steal through the barriers of Paris, and reached the plains of Mont Rouge, in the district of Bourg-la-Reine, where he hoped to have found an asylum in the country-house of a gentleman with whom he had once been intimate. This friend having, unfortunately, at that very time, gone to Paris, Condorcet was under the necessity of wandering about in the fields and woods for three successive days and nights, not venturing to enter into any inn unprovided with a civic card.

Exhausted by hunger, fatigue and anguish, with a wound in his foot, he was scarcely able to drag himself into a deserted quarry, where he purposed to await the return of his friend. At length, having advanced towards the road side, Condorcet saw him approach, was recognized, and received with open arms: but, as they both feared lest Condorcet's frequent inquiries at his friend's house should have raised suspicions; and as, at any rate, it was not advisable for them to make their entrance together, in the day-time, they agreed that Condorcet should stay in the fields till dusk. It was then, however, that imprudence threw him off his guard.

The forlorn exile, after having patiently borne hunger and thirst for three days together without so much as approaching an inn, now finds himself incapable of waiting a few hours longer, at the end of which all his sufferings were to subside in the bosom of friendship. Transported with this happy prospect, and foregoing all caution, which seemed to have become habitual to him, he entered an inn at Clamars, and called for an omelet. His attire, his dirty cap, and long beard, his pale meagre countenance, and the ravenous appetite with which he devoured the viands, could not fail to excite the curiosity and suspicion of the company.

A member of the revolutionary committee, who happened to be present, taking it for granted that

this woe-begone figure could be no other than some run-away from the Bicetre, addressed and questioned him whence he came, whether he could produce a passport, &c. which inquiries, Condorcet, having lost all self-command, answered so unsatisfactorily, that he was taken to the house of the committee as a suspected person. Thence, having undergone a second interrogatory, during which he acquitted himself equally ill, he was conducted to Bourg-la-Reine: and as he gave very inconsistent answers to the questions put to him by the municipality, it was inferred, that this unknown person must have some very important reasons for wishing to continue undiscovered.

Being sent to a temporary confinement till the matter should be cleared up, on the next morning he was found senseless on the ground, without any marks of violence on his body; whence it was conjectured that he must have poisoned himself. It was well known Condorcet had for some time before carried about him the most deadly poison; and not long before his fatal exit, he owned to a friend, that he had more than twenty times been tempted to make use of it, but was checked by motives of affection for his wife and daughter.

It was during his concealment of ten months at Paris, that he wrote his excellent *History of the Progress of Human Understanding*.

Thus perished one of the most illustrious of the French literati that the present age had produced.

PARALLEL OF THE SEXES.

"There is an admirable partition of qualities between the sexes, which the Great Author of being has distributed to each, with a wisdom which calls for all our admiration.

Man is strong—Woman is beautiful. Man is daring and confident—Woman is diffident and unassuming. Man is great in action—Woman in suffering. Man shines abroad—Woman at home. Man talks to convince—Woman to persuade and please. Man has a rugged heart—Woman a soft and tender one. Man prevents misery—Woman relieves it. Man has science—Woman taste. Man has judgment—Woman sensibility. Man is a being of justice—Woman of mercy."

MARRIED.

In Taunton, Mr. Elijah Walker to Miss Sally Chase, both of Wellington.

In Dedham, Mr. Calvin Howe to Miss Polly Richards.

In Watertown, Mr. John A. Underwood, of Boston, to Miss Jane Hunnewell, daughter of Dr. Hunnewell.

In New-York, 11th inst. Mr. Henry Grinnell, merchant, to Miss Sally Minturn, daughter of the late William Minturn, Esq.

DIED.

In Providence, Mr. William Crapon, aged 37.

In Newburyport, Mr. John Stone, aged 70. While exercising himself in his garden, he instantaneously fell and expired!

SHIP NEWS.

PORT OF NEW-BEDFORD.

ARRIVED.

June 18—Sloop Harmony, Crowell, Providence.

19th—Sloop Phebe, Nickerson, New-York.

20th—Sch. Polly, Hardin, from Kennebeck, with lumber.

21st—Sloop Shepherdess, Wood, New-York.

22d—Sloop William, Crapo, Philadelphia.

23d—Sloop Dread, Burr, New-York.

Cleared—Ships Timoleon, Starbuck, South Sea;

George & Martha, Randall, do.; brigs Resident, Tripp,

Hamburg; Horatio, Snow, New-York; sloops Experiment, Taber, do.; Henry, West, Providence.